DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 223 FL 016 355

AUTHOR Mead, Richard
TITLE Communicative and Grammatical Syllabuses to Teach Conversational Skills.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 14p.; In: Saltarelli, Mario, Ed. The Foreign Language Syllabus--Grammar, Notions and Functions. Urbana, Language Learning Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1983; see FL 016 352.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Journal Articles (080)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communicative Competence (Languages); *Conversational Language Courses; Course Content; Course Descriptions; *Curriculum Design; Difficulty Level; *English for Special Purposes; Foreign Countries; Form Classes (Languages); *Grammar; Higher Education; Oral Language; Second Language Instruction; *Structural Grammar; Teacher Role; Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Communicative Approach

ABSTRACT

The application of communicative and grammatical approaches to syllabus design for conversational English for specific purposes is discussed. Each approach is examined, and applications are suggested for each at different stages of instruction, based on learner readiness and the linguistic organization of the target language variety. At the early stages of language learning, a grammar-based syllabus is recommended to provide a common frame of grammatical reference that is context-free. As the course of instruction continues and the relationship between the learner, teacher, and instructional materials changes, the teacher is encouraged to change the balance of approaches, perhaps introducing each new language topic in terms of its grammatical form but increasing the use of communicative categories. As the personal relationship between teacher and learner develops, reference to shared communicative values becomes easier and this may be reflected in the syllabus. (MSE)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED278223

# COMMUNICATIVE AND GRAMMATICAL SYLLABUSES TO TEACH CONVERSATIONAL SKILLS

RICHARD MEAD
*University of Birmingham, UK*
*and*
*University of Malaya*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Mainous

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FLC/6 355

*Studies in Language Learning (1982), 4, 33-45.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This paper discusses the case for applying communicative and grammatical descriptions of data in syllabuses designed to teach conversational English for Specific Purposes (ESP).[1] Suggestions have been made by writers for the organization of the communicative syllabus. One is quoted below, and is examined from the point of view of the relationship implied between content and its linguistic expression. My argument is supported by fragments of conversational data, taken from a corpus of undergraduate small-group mechanical engineering data collected in UK universities (discussed further in Mead (1980)). The problems of applying communicative and/or grammatical analyses to a conversational syllabus are thrown into relief by consideration of the problems involved in applying analyses of written text to a reading syllabus. The paper is concluded by suggesting how an appropriate balance may be made between communicative and grammatical criteria.

All language syllabuses are communicative in the conventional sense that they are intended to teach the ability to communicate. But the term is used here with the technical meaning generally agreed upon by Wilkins (1976), Widdowson (1978), Breen and Candlin (forthcoming), and others. These writers have tended to restrict their discussion of the communicative syllabus to the ESP syllabus. By the term *ESP syllabus* I mean the following. When language is taught in conjunction with a content course, the ESP syllabus is subordinate to some description of overall educational objectives, by which the relationships of the ESP syllabus and the content syllabus/syllabuses are organized. The syllabuses differentiate and order the processes by which the curriculum objectives can be achieved. The ESP syllabus specifies the content, form, and sequence of the language teaching materials, and must also influence the choice of language teaching methodology. This paper, however, is concerned only with establishing the theoretical basis of the ESP syllabus. Wilkins (1976) makes a case for a communicative (or notional) syllabus, which makes the relationship between language and content the central issue.

> "...in drawing up a notional syllabus, instead of asking how speakers of the language express themselves or when and where they use the language, we ask what it is they communicate through language. We are then able to organise language teaching in terms of the content rather than the form of the language....The advantage of the notional syllabus is that it takes the communicative facts of language into account from the beginning without losing sight of grammatical and situational factors. It is potentially superior to the grammatical syllabus because it will produce a communicative competence and because its evident concern with the use of language will sustain the motivation of the learners....The process of deciding what to teach is based on consideration of what the learners should most usefully be able to communicate in the foreign language. When this is established, we can decide what are the most appropriate forms for each type of communication. The labelling for the learning units is now primarily semantic..." (pp. 18-19).

Wilkins argues that the syllabus can be designed "in terms of the content rather than the form of the language." This is a position also held by other writers, and which I am going to attack. It suggests that the content is described in terms of conceptual generalizations, and that the syllabus comprises their linguistic expressions. But so far as conversation is concerned,

the relationship between language and the content to which it refers is often indirect. This point is illustrated by fragment (a).

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| (a) | Tutor: | ...is it clear why . why that's wrong? | 1 |
| | Student: | yeah | |
| | Tutor: | I (mean we've got two things that are equal | |
| | Student: | (yeah yeah | |
| | Tutor: | . and that voltage is equal to either of them | 5 |
| | Student: | yeah | |
| | Tutor: | and you can get the information as to the current that flows down there from the voltage (along and | |
| | Student: | (mm | |
| | Tutor: | the current that flows down there from the voltage alone... | 10<br>11 |

The participants are discussing the solution to a test paper problem. But their conversation gives a very incomplete model of the content under discussion, and of the cognitive operations involved in doing the problem. The constraints imposed by the content are not made explicit. They belong to the participants' shared knowledge, and are not expressed in the realization scheme, and therefore cannot be appealed to for an interpretation of what is said. Furthermore, the language includes features that are necessary to the maintenance of the conversation but redundant in terms of the content; for instance, the check question and answer in the first two lines ("is it clear why . why that's wrong?"/"yeah"), and the student's acknowledgement markers ("yeah," "yeah," "yeah," "mm").

In all conversations (whether desultary or academic), the structural relationships between opening and answering moves are of greater significance in its organization than the expression of content. A question makes the structural prediction of an answer, and unless entirely inappropriate, whatever follows it will be heard as an answer. In the following (invented) example, Speaker B's utterance is not connected by semantic links.

Speaker A: Can you tell me where the meeting is?

Speaker B: The receptionist will be back in a moment.

But despite the lack of semantic connection, the exchange is well-formed (given an appropriate context) in the sense that Speaker B provides an appropriate answer. Speaker B's utterance can be paraphrased as "I can't tell you where the meeting is because I don't know/won't tell you because it isn't my job, but the receptionist can/will, and she will be back to help you in a moment." In fact, an utterance that makes content explicit may even be inappropriate; for instance, "yes, I can tell you where the meeting is," without the offer of further information, would sound very strange.

The importance of analyzing and teaching conversation in terms of structural form rather than communicative categories is exemplified by a similar fragment from the data. I am particularly interested in the last two lines.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| (b) Tutor: | ...you haven't been for about . what? . four or five weeks? (1) you're only here tonight because I . sent a rude message (1) aren't you? (2) what's the problem? | 1 |
| Student: | (1) oh . nothing | |
| Tutor: | well I mean presumably you don't think you get anything at all (1) out of our (1) meetings | 5 |
| Student: | (1) hm | |
| Tutor: | is that right? | |
| Student: | no | |
| Tutor: | . well there must be a reason | 10 |
| Student: | well I feel a bit tired | 11 |

The tutor's utterance "well there must be a reason" has the effect of asking a question that might be paraphrased as "what is the reason (that you don't come to our meetings)?". This *wh-* question demands a proposition in the answer, which the student supplies: "well I feel a bit tired." If the student had answered with ∅, or an acknowledgment--reciprocal to a declarative form that only provides information--he would have answered inappropriately.

Communicative categories that might be applied to these two utterances include "asking for an excuse" + "giving an excuse"; "making an inquiry" + "making an exposition"; or, grossly, "asking a question" + "giving an answer." Although these are my categories rather than Wilkins', I suggest there is no formal basis on which communicative categories can be distinguished and labelled, and any one of these pairs is adequate.

But the communicative functions of the utterances are only apparent within the extended context. And teaching the language learner any of the suggested categories does not tell him when the first in each pair may be realized by a declarative form, or when a declarative form expects ∅ acknowledgment, or a *yes/no* response, or a proposition, or activity. And although an utterance such as "What is your excuse (for not coming to our meeting?)" is, of course, possible, I suggest that demands for an excuse are in practice seldom so explicit.

These utterances might instead be explained by the following table; any of the grammatical forms on the left can elicit the form on the right. (This description is adapted from Sinclair (1980), in which the grammatical features of structural relationships between opening and answering moves are discussed in detail.)

| | OPENING: | ANSWERING: |
|---|---|---|
| (a) SP | (subject followed by predicate) | |
| eg: | There must be a reason why you don't come to our meeting. | |
| (b) P[S] | (subject inside predicate) | SP (subject followed by predicate) |
| eg: | Is there a reason why you don't come to our meetings? | eg: I feel a bit tired |
| (c) *wh*- P[S] | (subject inside predicate, preceded by interrogative *wh*-?) | |
| eg: | What is the reason that you don't come/Why don't you come to our meetings? | |

I argue that the grammatical options chosen by speakers carry communicative implications, and that communicative skills are taught when grammatical forms are taught within appropriate co-texts and contexts. For this reason the tutor's choice of the unmarked form (a) in preference to the marked interrogatives (b) ("Is there a reason...?") and (c) ("What is the reason...?") is significant to the syllabus writer. I suggest that (c), and perhaps also (b), are more likely to occur as initial in the topic, whereas (a) *may* presuppose earlier discussion. This is borne out here. In line 3 ("what's the problem") the tutor asks for a reason for the student's non-attendance; the student does not give a reason; in lines 5-6 the tutor offers a possible reason; in line 9 the student rejects the offer. And so the tutor's choice of the unmarked form realizes not only a request but also a summarizing function.

The relationships between the opening and answering moves discussed above can be graded in the syllabus in terms of the degree to which the formal relationship between them is explicit.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| syllabus item 1: | (c) *wh*- P/S/ | SP (Opening interrogative move marked as *wh*-?) |
| syllabus item 2: | (b) P/S/ | SP (Opening interrogative move is not marked as *wh*-?) |
| syllabus item 3: | (a) SP | SP (Opening move is not marked as interrogative) |

Fragment (b) (perhaps slightly edited) supplies an appropriate co-text within which the communicative value of syllabus item 3 can be taught.

I have indicated that the communicative syllabus presupposes a description of real data because communicative categories cannot be safely intuited. In the example given above description can be applied directly to the syllabus design; however, this is not always the case. In general the data shows the tutor playing the more active role. The student is reluctant to suggest topics, and may be unable to answer questions appropriately; examples are given in fragments (c) and (d).

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| (c) | Tutor: | ...one plus J something . and there may be a number there as well (4) all right? | 1 |
| | Student 1: | yuh | |
| | Tutor: | (3) any more problems? | |
| | Student 3: | (3) not really no | 5 |
| | Tutor: | how's the laboratory work going? | |
| | Student 1: | not too bad sir | 7 |

In fragment (c), the student does not exploit his opportunities to suggest a conversational topic; the tutor makes the choice himself.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| (d) | Tutor: | at what age would you expect a child to be ninety? (5) at what age . it would be that high wouldn't it? | 1 |
| | Student: | yah | |
| | Tutor: | at about what age? | |
| | Student: | say . ten | 5 |
| | Tutor: | no . impossible . a ten year old would be much bigger than that . that's ninety . it would be about a six year old (4) now how heavy would they be? . half your weight or less? (1) how fat would they be?... | 9 |

In fragment (d), the student is unable to answer questions correctly, and fails to say what he cannot answer.

If it is desirable that the student should play a committed role in conversation and that when unable to answer a question should explain his difficulty rather than keep quiet, then these fragments show behavior that falls far short of the ideal. Hence, they do not provide a model that can be directly applied to the design of a syllabus teaching conversational skills. This underlines the point that the relationship between descriptive and prescriptive models is determined pragmatically, and is variable.

To sum up thus far: I have argued that the relationship that conversational language has to the content it expresses may be indirect and that description of the content does not necessarily explain the speaker's choice of language forms. Hence a description of content cannot usually be applied to teaching the appropriate forms. Instead, conversation should be taught in terms of its typical structure within a particular variety (in this case, small-group engineering), and of the ranges of grammatical forms from which the structure is organized. I now wish to examine the methodological implications of applying a system of communicative conversational categories.

The analyst employs communicative conversational categories as a means of summarizing the effects of utterances which he intuitively recognizes as realizing similar functions. But the learner does not have access to or understanding of the utterances from which the communicative categories are inferred. He can only recognize the communicative common denominator in a range of utterances when he understands the meaning and effects of the

individual utterances. So the use of communicative categories may unreasonably presuppose the pedagogic outcome of teaching recognition and production of the utterances.

The communicative syllabus writer is obliged to construct and in some way interrelate a finite set of communicative categories. He must show precisely what he means by a particular category and demonstrate the conditions under which an utterance should be considered an exponent of that category.

But even if he succeeds in organizing a set of categories, the precise meanings of the various categories will be unstable in different situational contexts and linguistic co-texts. Communicative categories, unlike grammatical categories, are context and co-text dependent for their functional meaning. The problem is exacerbated to the extent that the learner lacks experience of the type of context and co-text. The use of communicative categories assumes recognition of cultural and sociolinguistic values which may not be shared by learners from different backgrounds. Some instruction in the technical terminology of linguistic description may be unavoidable, but this should never become a major responsibility for the teacher.

I wish to demonstrate this point by considering the difficulties introduced by a communicative syllabus that distinguishes between *requesting* (something), and *asking about* (something); (my categories). These categories are clearly different when exemplified by the following utterances, and should be distinguished in the syllabus.

| | |
|---|---|
| *requesting*: | Please close the door<br>Could you tell me where the meeting is? |
| *asking about*: | Have you been to Blackpool?<br>Is this made of copper or zinc? |

But the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* (Sixth Edition, 1976) defines "request" as "act of asking for something." This suggests at a deeper level of description, any *asking about* utterance (and perhaps any question) can be redefined as *requesting* information, and therefore as an exponent of a subcategory of the *requesting* category. Unless the learner is first given the conceptual apparatus needed to differentiate these categories, I suggest that he first be taught grammatical realizations. For instance:

ask (noun phrase) to (verb phrase) - *requesting*

{ask if/whether (noun prase, verb phrase)
ask what/when/why/where/who/how ((noun phrase) verb phrase)} - *asking about*

Before going on to consider written text, I want to take up two further points from Wilkins' argument. He claims that the communicative syllabus "is potentially superior to the grammatical syllabus because it will produce a communicative competence." But the application of linguistic analysis to language teaching is pragmatic and the intention to teach communication does not guarantee the result; the use of a communicative syllabus does not guarantee

communicative teaching. Whether communicative or grammatical categories are applied may make little difference if the exponents are treated overdiscretely.

Wilkins also suggests that the communicative syllabus is superior because "its evident concern with the use of language will sustain the motivation of the learners." But if the learner fails to recognize the general significance of the communicative categories, and their relationship to the production and recognition of actual utterances, their use may be counter-productive. In countries in which language education is grammatically based (for instance, in the Middle East), the learner has been conditioned to think of language learning as a matter of deploying the exponents of grammatical categories. If the switch to a communicative syllabus is managed incautiously, his expectations (whether good or bad) are frustrated. He may fail to recognize the nature of the activity, and complain that his time is being wasted with games.

The case against the communicative syllabus is made forcibly by Brumfit (1980). "Grammatical features are parts of a system, and it is the system which is being learnt, though often not explicitly or overtly. We have no comparable understanding of the system of communicative functions. It is only by presenting a heavily stereotyped situation that I can show whether a specific utterance is warning rather than threatening, and even native speakers may disagree--as they often do in a court of law--over what exactly has taken place....Yet communicative function--at the specific level which the learner requires--demands a consideration of all probable motives for speaking. We are asking either that the whole of normal human relationships should be systematized and related to language, or that we should base our syllabuses on a mere list of subjectively chosen, unrelatable items. Neither of these seems to be a very sensible proposal. On the other hand, to base a syllabus on a geniune system, like the grammatical system, and to use a list of functions simply as a checklist, to be integrated methodologically into the practical working out of a syllabus in teaching, would seem to be a very sensible approach to take" (pp. 117-118).

Yet Brumfit overstates the case. Firstly, no syllabus, whether grammatical or communicative, can take into account all possibly contexts or co-texts; stereotyping is inevitable. Secondly, a checklist of communicative functions would presumably need to be organized by the same procedures that are operated when the communicative syllabus is prime. Thirdly, Brumfit's objections are less sound when applied to the teaching of reading skills.

The qualifications that must be made when the ESP is text based help to highlight my comments about the application of conversational analysis. The varieties of conversation and written text are significantly different, even when expressing the same content. Conversation is non-linear in the sense that it is multiple source and there is interactive participation by more than one person, although of course participation continues along a linear time base. Written text is non-linear in that the reader may refer backwards and forwards, make omissions, and interrupt his reading at will. Roe (1977) shows how the writer can exploit these features of performances. For instance, the text need not maintain constant "density"; certain sections may be skipped. Some parts, such as appendices and indexes, are optional and recursive. Equations and diagrams take the place of grammatical utterances. The text may be

organized in terms of information needed to solve given sets of problems and quizzes.

I have suggested that structural relationships rather than the conceptual organization of content is decisive in conversation. But this is not the case in written text. The writer does not enjoy the freedom to make incomplete and ungrammatical sentences, and references to a (presumed) situational context must usually be made explicit.

The speaker may name his topic, but this is only very weakly predictive of semantic organization of the conversation that follows. This point is exemplified by fragment (e); this makes a continuation of fragment (c). The tutor suggests a topic, laboratory work, in the first line.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| (e) | Tutor: | how's the laboratory work going? | 1 |
| | Student 1: | not too bad sir | |
| | Tutor: | who do you work with in the laboratory? | |
| | Student 1: | er I work with erm . an Indian boy | |
| | Tutor: | an Indian boy, hm hm? | 5 |
| | Student 2: | I work with er David . Wong | |
| | Tutor: | (2) I don't know him . what | |
| | Student 2: | no . erm | |
| | Tutor: | erm what nationality is he? | |
| | Student 2: | Jap . Japanese or Chinese | 10 |
| | Tutor: | Chinese hm | |
| | Student 2: | I don't know | |
| | Tutor: | what from Singapore or Malaya or | |
| | Student 2: | no he's English . with<br>er Chinese origin | 15 |
| | Tutor: | English with a Chinese origin . hm | |
| | Student 2: | he's one of those (who | |
| | Tutor: | (what's his English language like? | |
| | Student 2: | speaks with a Birmi Birmingham accent | |
| | Tutor: | a Birmingham accent ((laughs)) (no really? | 20 |
| | Student 2: | (it isn't quite that (1) that bad . but<br>he has got er . an English area . er<br>regional accent I don't know where about it .<br>where abouts his family's from | |
| | Tutor: | (1) well now have you got any more problems<br>you'd like to discuss today? | 25 |
| | Student 1: | er no not really... | |

As the discussion continues, each utterance is coherent in terms of its immediate co-text. But the conversation drifts further and further away from the topic of laboratory work. (Topic "drift" is discussed in Coulthard, 1977). The conversation is "about" different things at different points; the identity of co-workers in the laboratory, the nationality of David Wong, his language competence.

However, the same license is not available to the writer of text, and predictions of content are likely to be fulfilled. If he titles his book "Introductory Economics" and promises ten chapters, the reader has some guarantee that he is not embarking upon a discussion of marine biology in twelve chapters. And if a paragraph begins "This system of valuation has two drawbacks," it may be predicted that a system of valuation is mentioned in the preceding co-text, and that two drawbacks to it will be discussed in the succeeding co-text. Semantic relationships between units at and above the level of the sentence are discussed in Hoey (forthcoming).

So written text is primarily organized by the semantic expression made of its content, and hence is perhaps more accessible to analysis made in terms of communicative functions. Nevertheless, it seems likely that the learner has least difficulty recognizing communicative categories of which the exponents are distinguished by particular grammatical forms or lexical markers. For instance, undergraduate Economics is characterized by the use of predictive conditionals:

> "A choice means that you have one thing or the other. If you choose to have more of one thing, then where there is more of one thing, then, where there is an effective choice, it will be necessary for you to have less of the other. Think of the members of an individual household with a certain amount of resources answering the question: 'How shall we use our resources?' If we have more of this then we must have less of that. If by cost we mean what must be given up in order to obtain something then the cost of bread is having less of something else" (Lipsey, 1963, p. 51).

I suggest that the predictive conditional should first be taught in terms of its grammatical realizations, which might be graded as follows:

syllabus item 1: *If* + noun phrase + verb phrase (verb present), *then* + noun phrase + verb phrase (verb present)
e.g.: If price increases, then demand decreases.

syllabus item 2: *If* + noun phrase + verb phrase (verb present), *then* + noun phrase + verb phrase (verb future)
e.g.: If price increases, then demand will decrease.

syllabus item 3: ...

In these instances, the knit between grammatical expression and content is perhaps as close as it can be. But other adverbs such as "supposing that," "when," and verbs "depend on" and "assume" are less explicit in their conditional implications. In different co-texts, their conditional meanings will vary; "when," for instance, is more often temporal. The conditional use of these forms should be described and taught within co-texts where the marked

conditional "if" can be substituted. For instance, note the use of "depends on" in the following text:

> "Producers require land, labour, raw materials, machines, and other factors of production because these are needed to produce the goods and services that the firm sells. So the demand for any factor of production *depends on* the existence of a demand for goods that it helps to make. We say that the demand is a DERIVED DEMAND" (Ibid., p. 330).

In different co-texts the meanings of "depends on" may vary between condition, causality, etc. Here it expresses a condition and this use might be taught towards from a version of the text edited as follows:

> ...these are needed to produce goods and services that the firm sells. So if there is a demand for the goods that a factor of production helps to make, then there is a demand for the factor of production. We say that the demand for this factor is a DERIVED DEMAND.

"Depends on" is not in free distribution with "if"; but the evidence suggests that a comprehensive syllabus covering the expression of predictive conditionals should include it:

> syllabus item n: noun phrase - *depends on* - noun phrase
> e.g.: The demand for a factor of production depends on the existence of a demand for the goods that it helps to make.

When the student has internalized the linguistic expression of the conditionals, he is able to understand the constraint imposed on the use of the predictive conditional by the conceptual nature of economic theory (and perhaps all social science theory). This is the principle of *ceteris paribus*--when all other relevant factors are held constant. For instance, the relationship suggested in the first two examples of syllabus items above between increasing price and decreasing demand is assumed to be true when factors such as increased advertising, changes in taste, the absence of substitute goods, etc., are ignored. Communicative categories of which the exponents are not distinguished by particular grammatical forms or lexical markers are likely to give greater difficulties in recognition and production. For instance, recognition of distinctions between exponents of *evaluation*, *suasion*, *argument* (Wilkins' categories) tend to be intuitive. Consider the following fragments:

> "Hypotheses like these are very hard to test. Proponents of organisation theory feel that the evidence supports them: critics feel that they are undemonstrated. It is hard to avoid the view that at the present time the evidence is inconclusive" (Ibid., p. 316).

The last sentence might be argued to express any of the three categories.

## CONCLUSIONS

I have discussed the cases for the application of communicative and grammatical syllabuses. Wilkins' case for the communicative syllabus can be faulted at several points; the counter argument made by Brumfit is overstated. I wish to conclude by suggesting where emphases on each of these two syllabuses might be most usefully made.

Perhaps in its early stages any ESP syllabus designed for use by students of intermediate or elementary grammatical ability should be grammar based. Experience of language instruction at schools has provided most ESP learners with a common frame of grammatical reference, which is relatively context free and may be exploited. But, as I have shown, the grammatical meaning of an item affects and is affected by the meaning of its co-text; the choice of grammatical option made by the speaker/writer carries communicative implications. And grammatical items should be taught within appropriate co-texts.

As the course of ESP instruction continues, the relationship between the learner, the teacher, and the materials changes, and the original constraints on the application of communicative categories may be modified. The learner plays an increasing role in identifying his communicative needs and expectations, and the teacher adapts his selection of materials and methodology in the light of the learner's developing abilities and motivation. Perhaps each new language topic in the ESP syllabus is introduced in terms of its grammatical exponents, but when this introduction has been made, the emphasis becomes increasingly communicative and communicative categories can be used.

As the personal relationship between teacher and learner develops, reference to shared communicative values becomes easier, and this may be reflected in the syllabus. When the teacher and learner are sufficiently confident of their relationship, I would agree with Breen and Candlin (forthcoming) that a communicative methodology can:

> "exploit the classroom as a resource with its own communicative potential. The classroom is only one resource in language teaching, but it is also the meeting-place of all other resources--learners, teachers, and texts. Each of these has sufficiently heterogeneous characteristics to make classroom-based negotiation a necessary undertaking....The authenticity of the classroom lies in its dual role of observatory and laboratory during a communicative learning-teaching process" (p. 7).

But, as I suggested above, there is no one-to-one relationship between a communicative syllabus and communicative teaching, and communicative (in the sense of effective) teaching very often occurs even when the syllabus emphasizes grammatical systems.

The movement from a grammatical to a communicative emphasis may be perceived in terms of a cline. The balance at any one moment will be determined by a number of factors. I have not discussed the significance of different teaching styles, the conceptual organization of the related content syllabus/syllabuses, the learner's attitudes to English culture and the degree of his

instrumental and integrative motivation. These issues do not belong in this paper, but are relevant. What I have done is to distinguish between the organization of conversation and written text. The differences suggest that communicative categories might be introduced in a syllabus designed to teach reading ESP at an earlier stage than in a syllabus designed to teach conversational ESP. I conclude that the communicative or grammatical emphasis of a syllabus should reflect the linguistic characteristics of the skill that it teaches. That is, a language syllabus should be based on analysis of the target variety of language. It might seem that I am proposing a third type of syllabus, the discourse syllabus. But in the present climate, normative models of ideal syllabus types tend to be interpreted dogmatically. My position throughout has been that we should pay more attention to the constraints imposed by the linguistic organization of the target variety, and by the pedagogic context within which the syllabus is applied.

REFERENCES

Breen, M., and C.N. Candlin, forthcoming, "The Essentials of a Communicative Curriculum in Language Teaching," *Applied Linguistics* 1(2).

Brumfit, C., 1980, *Problems and Principles in English Teaching*. London: Pergamon Press.

Coulthard, M., 1977, *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.

Hoey, M., forthcoming, *On the Surface of Discourse*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Lipsey, R.G., 1963 (third edition, 1974), *An Introduction to Positive Economics*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Mead, R., 1980, *An Analysis of Small-Group Discourse and its Application*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: University of Birmingham, U.K.

Roe, P.J., 1977, *The Notion of Difficulty in Scientific Text*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation: University of Birmingham, U.K.

Sinclair, J.McH., forthcoming, "Discourse in Relation to Language Structure and Semiotics," in Greenbaum, S., G. Leech, and J. Svartvik, eds., *Studies in English Linguistics for Randolph Quirk*. London: Longman.

Widdowson, H.G., 1978, *Teaching English as Communication*. London: Oxford University Press.

Wilkins, D.A., 1976, *Notional Syllabus*. London: Oxford University Press.

NOTES

[1] I owe many thanks to Malcolm Coulthard, Michael Howey, and Chris Kennedy, whose helpful suggestions on an earlier draft I have attempted to incorporate here.